UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/507,535 03/08/2005 | | Thomas Sonnenrein | 10191/3836 | 1376 |
| 26646 KENYON & K | 7590 06/23/201 ENYON LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| ONE BROADY | | FISHER, MICHAEL J | | |
| NEW YORK, N | NY 10004 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3689 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/23/2010 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| 10/507,535 | SONNENREIN ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| MICHAEL J. FISHER | 3689 | |

| | MICHAEL J. FISHER | 3689 | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>21 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | | = | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejectio | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>20 January 2010</u>. A bri the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), of appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS | or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4 | 1.37(e)), to avoid disn | nissal of the | | | |
| 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief | will not be entered be | cause | | | |
| (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor | | | oaase | | | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | v); | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | er form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | octed claims | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ⁻¹ | | cted ciairis. | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | , | mnliant Amendment (F | PTOL-324) | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mphane / amonamone (1 | 102 02 1). | | | |
| 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | t canceling the | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>16 and 18-32</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a | | | |
| 10. | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attache | ed. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| /Janice A. Mooneyham/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689 | /Michael J Fisher/ Examiner, Art Unit 3689 | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: As to arguments in relation to the drawings, this objection has been withdrawn. As to arguments in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, the rejection stands, there is no standard for a "plausibility check", there would need to be undue experimentation to determine what is plausible and further, as there is no concrete standard, different people would read this differently and as such, there is no way to determine what is exactly meant by this. As to arguments in relation to the amended claims, as they have not been entered and will not be entered, any arguments based on this will not be responded to as they raise new issues that would require a substantial change in the rejection and therefore, the case would not be proper for appeal. As to arguments in relation to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner explained exactly why the modifications were obvious, properly giving a rationale for such modifications, therefore, they are deemed proper.